

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/598,304	06/21/2000	Masafumi Ata	P00.1318	7242

26263 7590 03/01/2002

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL
P.O. BOX 061080
WACKER DRIVE STATION
CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080

EXAMINER

CHEN, BRET P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1762

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/598,304

Applicant(s)
Masafumi Ata et al.

Examiner
Bret Chen

Art Unit
1762



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Dec 31, 2001

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above, claim(s) 1-11 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-24 is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:

1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

20) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1762

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-24 are pending in this application. The preliminary amendment dated 6/21/00 has been entered.

Election/Restriction

1. Applicant's election of Group II, claims 12-24 in Paper No. 8 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)). Claims 1-11 have been withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a nonelected invention.

Priority

2. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Specification

3. Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set

Art Unit: 1762

forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:

- (1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;
- (2) if an article, its method of making;
- (3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;
- (4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
- (5) **if a process, the steps.**

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given.

It is noted that the claimed invention is directed to a method. The examiner suggests amending the abstract to reflect same.

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities listed below.

Appropriate correction is required.

On p.52 line 18, the word should be --from-- not "form".

5. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Art Unit: 1762

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. Claims 12-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 14 line 3, the term “said smooth surface” lacks antecedent basis.

In claim 15 line 3, the term “said fullerene polymer film” lacks antecedent basis. The same issue applies to claim 17.

The limitation of claim 17 is confusing as to the order of the layers. Initially the require order is a carbonaceous film and a pair of electrodes. However, the applicant requires an intermediate fullerene polymer film. Clarification and appropriate amendments are requested.

Claim 18 is redundant and should be deleted.

Claim 20 is confusing and incomplete. It is not clear what is required by the instant claim. Appropriate amendments are requested.

In claim 21 line 3, the term “said fullerene molecules” lacks antecedent basis. The same issue applies to claim 22.

Claim 22 is confusing. The examiner suggests deleting “of said fullerene molecules” in line 3 and deleting “in vapor-depositing said fullerene ... electromagnetic waves” in lines 4-6.

In claim 23 lines 3-4, the term “said vacuum chamber” lacks antecedent basis.

The other dependent claims do not cure the defects of the claims from which they depend.

Art Unit: 1762

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 12-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Bethune et al. (5,374,463) in view of Bhushan et al. (5,558,903). Bethune discloses a method of depositing an amorphous carbon film followed by a fullerene layer (col.11 line 41 - col.12 line 23). The amorphous carbon can be deposited by high energy beams including ion beams (col.6 lines 51-65). However, the reference fails to teach the formation of a carbon film by thermal decomposition of an organic compound.

Bhushan discloses a method for coating fullerene materials by decomposing organic materials (col.3 lines 41-51). It is well known that carbon materials can be deposited by a number of techniques. Each technique has advantages and disadvantages known in the art such as increased throughput but higher deposition temperatures leading to increased thermal budgets. It would have been obvious to utilize a thermal decomposition technique with the expectation of obtaining the known advantages as indicated above.

In claim 14, the applicant requires a specific roughness. It is well settled that determination of optimum values of cause effective variables such as these process parameters is within the skill of one practicing in the art.

Art Unit: 1762

In claim 15-17, the applicant requires specific materials. These limitations have been addressed in cols.1-2 of Bhushan.

The limitations of claims 21-24 have been addressed above.

Tanaka et al. (6,251,522), Mirkin et al. (5,338,571) and Iijima have been provided for additional information.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bret Chen whose telephone number is (703) 308-3809. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 6:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shrive Beck, can be reached on (703) 308-2333. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9310. Amendment After Finals should be faxed to (703) 872-9311.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

bc
February 27, 2002


BRET CHEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER